REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the instant application. The Specification has been objected to due to informalities. Claims 1-17 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 9-17 have been amended. New claims 18 and 19 have been added. The Applicants submit that claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

Objections to the Specification

The Specification has been objected to due to informalities. The Applicants have amended the Specification to correct typographical errors in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §101

Claims 11-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 as allegedly being directed to the non-statutory subject area of electro-magnetic signals. The Applicants have amended the preamble of claim 11 to recite a "computer program product embodied on a computer-readable medium for providing dynamic deployment of grid services over a computer network, the computer program product including instructions executable by a computer processor." The Applicants submit that claim 11 fully complies with the requirements set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner states that claims 11-17 appear to represent nonfunctional descriptive material. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Claims 11-17 recite a computer program product that implements *dynamic deployment of grid services over a computer network*. As such, these claims clearly impart functionality when employed as a computer component in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 101. The Applicants submit that claim 11 fully complies with the requirements set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 12-17 depend from what should be an allowable claim 11. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 11-17 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Java (Article entitled "Java Programmer's Guide").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants traverse the outstanding rejections because "Java" does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the Applicants claims.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a "method for *providing dynamic deployment of grid services over a computer network*, comprising: installing grid artifacts in a directory located on a target hosting environment in response to an invocation of an implementation of a deployment grid service by a client system, the target hosting environment remotely located from the client system over the computer network, said grid artifacts including: a Web service deployment descriptor; a service implementation; and a WSDL describing said service implementation; and providing addressability of said grid service to the client system over the computer network by updating said Web service deployment descriptor with service data elements and typemappings associated with said client system; wherein said artifacts are resident in a GAR file provided by a grid services deployment system."

These features are neither taught nor suggested by the Java reference. The Java Programmer's Guide cited by the Examiner describes a method for building and managing grid services in the Globus toolkit. The reference teaches co-located, non-dynamic, and non-network based grid services (pages 3-5). Moreover, the Java reference fails to teach or suggest a 'deployment grid service' as recited in Applicants' claim 1. By contrast, the features recited in claim 1 are directed to an automated dynamic deployment of grid services. In addition, as recited in amended claim 1, the deployment is conducted over a computer network between a client system, a grid service deployment system, and a target hosting environment. No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Support may be found throughout the Applicants' Specification and Figures (e.g., Figure 1 and paragraph [0022]).

Accordingly, Applicants' claim 1 is not anticipated by the Java reference and is believed

to be in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 11 have been similarly amended. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 9 and 11 are also patentable over the Java reference and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 2-4, 6, 12-14, and 16 recite specific implementation details relating to the deployment (i.e., once the GAR files have been delivered to the deployment service). In particular, the service implementation recited in claim 2, e.g., relates back to the grid service deployment system in claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. The Java reference fails to disclose this implementation *as part of an operating grid service deployment system*. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6, 12-14, and 16 are not anticipated by the Java reference. In addition, claims 2-4, 6, 12-14, and 16 are in condition for allowance due to their dependencies upon what should be allowable base claims.

Claims 7 and 17 are also believed to be patentable over the Java reference. Claims 7 and 17 recite multiple simultaneous deployments of grid services. These features are neither taught, nor suggested by the Java reference. Rather, Java teaches it is possible to deploy N services, one at a time where the final image has multiple services deployed (page 5). However, Java does not teach multiple *simultaneous* deployments as recited in claims 7 and 17. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 7 and 17 are in condition for allowance. New claims 18 and 19 depend from what should be an allowable claim 17 and are, for at least this reason, believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 is further believed to be patentable over the Java reference. Claim 10 recites a user interface for interacting with the network-enabled client system. The Examiner indicates that this feature may be found on page 1 of the Java reference. However, the Applicants respectfully disagree. There is simply no teaching of a user interface anywhere in this reference. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Java (Article entitled "Java Programmer's Guide") as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, and 16-17 above and in view of Wilder-Mcbride (Book entitled "Java Development on PDAs:

Building Applications for PocketPC and Palm Devices).

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 5, 8, and 15. Claims 5 and 15 depend from what should be considered allowable base claims as described above. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 5 and 15 are in condition for allowance. In addition, as indicated above with respect to claim 1, the Java reference teaches grid service implementation in a co-located environment. Neither reference teaches an grid-undeployment service to accomplish an automated and dynamic un-deploy service over a network. By the same reasoning, the Applicants submit that claim 8 is not rendered obvious in view of the references. Claim 8, likewise, recites an un-deployment service over a computer network. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 5, 8, and 15 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the applicant deems to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 1-19 be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD B. BODEN, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By _Marisa J. Dubuc_____
    Marisa J. Dubuc
    Registration No. 46,673
    Customer No. 46429

Date: August 28, 2006

Address: 55 Griffin Road South
            Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115